



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/649,377	08/27/2003	Joerg Beringer	09282.0007.00000	4602
60668 7590 08/13/2010 SAP / FINNEGAN, HENDERSON LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413				
EXAMINER SWEARINGEN, JEFFREY R				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2445				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/13/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/649,377

Applicant(s)

BERINGER, JOERG

Examiner

Jeffrey R. Swearingen

Art Unit

2445

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 August 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 10-19, 21-25, 28, 29, 31 and 33-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 10-19, 21-25, 28, 29, 31 and 33-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's arguments filed 8/9/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. Applicant amended computer-readable recording medium to computer-readable medium. There still is no support within the specification for the term computer-readable medium. As best interpreted, Applicant is attempting to use the definition in the specification for a machine-readable medium as being applicable to a computer-readable medium. This claim amendment has triggered an appropriate rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101 for non-statutory subject matter and 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph for lack of antecedent basis. The specification objection remains.
3. Applicant argues that Scharber in view of Olivier failed to disclose *each one of the collaborative conversation channels having an associated set of message types that is based on a topic of the specific one of the defined communities and a member's role within the specific one of the defined communities...and according to pre-configured filter profiles corresponding to the member's role within the specific one of the defined communities*. Figure 4, item 404 of Olivier allows you to select if you are a Resident or a Business, and if you want to receive information from other Residents or Businesses (item 408). This is filtering based on a member's role in the community. A user can select from Subjects in item 414 including News, Recommendations, and Other. These are topics of the specific one of the defined communities. This is the equivalent of *each one of the collaborative conversation channels having an associated set of message types that is based on a topic of the specific one of the defined communities and a*

member's role within the specific one of the defined communities...and according to pre-configured filter profiles corresponding to the member's role within the specific one of the defined communities.

Specification

4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Claims 25 and 28 refer to a "computer-readable medium". Paragraph [0049] of the specification refers to a "machine-readable medium", but does not mention or define a "computer-readable medium". There is insufficient antecedent basis within the specification for the term "computer-readable medium".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 25 and 28 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

7. Claims 25 and 28 recite the limitation "computer-readable medium" in the specification. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the specification. This rejection is based on the current amendment to claims 25 and 28.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

8. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 25 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 25 and 28 are directed toward a computer-readable medium. Applicant failed to define computer-readable medium in the specification. This rejection is based upon the application of the definition of machine-readable medium in the specification, [0049]. Applicant defined a machine-readable medium to include a machine-readable medium that receives machine instructions as a machine-readable signal...The term machine-readable signal refers to any signal...used to provide machine instructions and/or data to the machine. Signals are non-transitory subject matter, and the definition of machine-readable medium in the specification allows machine-readable media to encompass signals per se. Signals per se are not patentable. In re Nuijten, 500 F.3d 1346, 1356-57 (Fed. Cir. 2007). In the alternative, the lack of an explicit definition for a computer-readable medium in the specification allows the broadest reasonable interpretation of computer-readable media to encompass signals per se. 1351 OG 212. This rejection is based on the current amendment to claims 25 and 28.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 1-8, 10-19, 21, 23-25, 28, 29, 31, and 33-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scharber (US 6,374,290) in view of Olivier (US 6,480,885).

11. In regard to claim 1, Scharber disclosed:

defining communities within the enterprise; column 3, line 37

associating collaborative conversation channels with the communities

wherein each one of the collaborative conversation channels is associated with a specific one of the defined communities; column 4, lines 52-59

providing access to one of the collaborative conversation channels through a user interface, with each one of the collaborative conversation channels having an associated set of message types that is based on a topic of the specific one of the defined communities; column 3, lines 13-29

receiving, through the user interface, a request to send a message having a selected message type within a selected one of the collaborative conversation channels, wherein the selected message type is selected at the user interface and the message is automatically filtered according to the selected message type; and column 4, lines 13-14

sending the message having the selected message type through the selected one of the collaborative conversation channels. Column 3, lines 50-62

12. Scharber failed to disclose *a member's role within the specific one of the defined communities and filtering messages according to pre-configured filter profiles corresponding to the member's role within the specific one of the defined communities.*

13. Olivier disclosed "criteria matching and message profile criteria" applied to "group forums, such as web-based discussion boards, chat, online clubs, USENET newsgroups, voicemail, instant messaging, web browsing side channel communities, and online gaming rendezvous". Olivier, Abstract.

14. Olivier further designated a user could be specified as a "moderator" of a discussion in Olivier, column 14, line 55 - column 15, line 21. The "moderator" is another version of a *member's role within the specific one of the defined communities*.

15. Olivier, column 24, line 66 - column 25, line 20 discloses a discussion board where a user can select a *topic of the specific one of the defined communities* ("a group forms around a theme") and a user "only sees content (...message postings...) of other users who form a match with the user." "Another alternative process is for to allow moderators, club owners, and other 'authorities' to view all messages..." Olivier, column 25, lines 7-10, lines 17-20. This is *each one of the collaborative conversation channels having an associated set of message types that is based on a topic of the specific one of the defined communities and a member's role within the specific one of the defined communities and according to pre-configured filter profiles corresponding to the member's role within the specific one of the defined communities*. Scharber disclosed that one of the preferences for a client could include permissions lists. Scharber, column 3, lines 18-19. Olivier states the user profile information "specif[ies] user profile data and acceptance criteria data that control with whom and about what topics they wish to interact". Olivier, column 5, lines 24-26. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Invention to use the acceptance criteria data of

Olivier as a client preference permission list in Scharber in order to prevent abusive users (Scharber, column 3, line 56).

16. In regard to claim 2, Scharber disclosed:

*identifying members of a specific community; and column 3, lines 36-41
providing the identified members with access to one of the collaborative
conversation channels that corresponds to the particular community. Column 3,
lines 50-62*

17. In regard to claim 3, Scharber disclosed:

*each one of the defined communities includes members with one of a
common fortune or a common interest. Column 3, lines 36-41*

18. In regard to claim 4, Scharber disclosed:

*constructing the collaborative conversation channels in accordance with at
least one generic channel type. Column 3, lines 36-41*

19. In regard to claim 5, Scharber disclosed:

*the generic channel type is selected from a group consisting of an
operational channel, a strategic channel, and an educational channel. Column 4,
lines 24-36*

20. In regard to claim 6, Scharber disclosed:

the set of message types includes predefined message templates.
Column 5, lines 3-4

21. In regard to claim 7, Scharber disclosed:

users obtain an implicit subscription to a collaborative conversation channel by becoming a member of one of the defined communities associated with one of the collaborative conversation channels. Column 3, lines 51-62

22. In regard to claim 8, Scharber disclosed:

users obtain an implicit subscription to one of the collaborative conversation channels based on information in personal user profiles. Column 3, line 9, lines 51-62

23. In regard to claims 10, 24, 28, Scharber disclosed:

providing filters for filtering the message received through one of the collaborative conversation channels based on at least one of a community type for one of the defined communities associated with one of the collaborative conversation channels and a channel type for one of the collaborative conversation channels. Column 3, lines 51-62

24. In regard to claim 11, Scharber disclosed:

the filters are pre-configured based on a pre-configured community.
Column 3, lines 51-62

25. In regard to claim 12, Scharber disclosed:

providing a predefined set of message types based on at least one of a community type for one of the defined communities associated with one of the collaborative conversation channels, a channel type for one of the collaborative conversation channels, and a community role for members of one of the defined

communities associated with one of the collaborative conversation channels.

Column 3, lines 51-62; column 5, lines 3-4

26. In regard to claim 13, Scharber disclosed:

providing access to a community place for each one of the defined communities having collaborative components that are based on a community type for each one of the defined communities, wherein access to one of the collaborative conversation channels is provided through the community place.

Column 3, lines 36-50

27. Claim 14 is substantially the same as claim 1.

28. In regard to claim 15, Scharber disclosed:

the enterprise base systems comprise applications for facilitating communications. Column 3, lines 3-5

29. In regard to claim 16, Scharber disclosed:

a message server for sending messages to the community through the collaborative conversation channel. Column 3, line 7

30. In regard to claim 17, Scharber disclosed:

the collaborative conversation channel application allows users to list a plurality of available collaborative conversation channels. Column 3, lines 36-50

31. In regard to claim 18, Scharber disclosed:

the collaborative conversation channel application allows users to search for a collaborative communication channel. Column 3, lines 36-50

32. In regard to claim 19, Scharber disclosed:

the collaborative conversation channel application provides a user interface for display on the client devices. Column 3, lines 9-12

33. In regard to claim 21, Scharber disclosed:

messages sent through the collaborative conversation channel are received by members of the community in a message center of the portal. Column 3, lines 21-30

34. In regard to claim 23, Scharber disclosed:

each message received in the message center includes an identification of the community to which the message relates. Column 3, lines 53-55

35. In regard to claim 25, Scharber disclosed:

providing access to collaborative channels through a user interface, with each one of the collaborative conversation channels associated with a specific community and having an associated set of message types that is based on a topic of the specific community; column 3, lines 36-50

receiving, through the user interface, a request to access a template for a selected message type within one of the collaborative conversation channels, wherein the selected message type is selected at the user interface and the message is automatically filtered according to the selected message type; column 3, lines 51-62; column 5, lines 3-4

presenting the template for the selected message type through the user interface; column 3, lines 51-62

- receiving user input for the template through the user interface to create a message of the selected message type; and column 3, lines 51-62*
36. *providing the message to a particular community through the associated collaborative conversation channel. Column 3, lines 51-62*
37. Scharber failed to disclose filtering messages *according to pre-configured filter profiles corresponding to a member's role within the associated community.*
38. Scharber failed to disclose *a member's role within the specific one of the defined communities* and filtering messages *according to pre-configured filter profiles corresponding to the member's role within the specific one of the defined communities.*
39. Olivier disclosed "criteria matching and message profile criteria" applied to "group forums, such as web-based discussion boards, chat, online clubs, USENET newsgroups, voicemail, instant messaging, web browsing side channel communities, and online gaming rendezvous". Olivier, Abstract.
40. Olivier further designated a user could be specified as a "moderator" of a discussion in Olivier, column 14, line 55 - column 15, line 21. The "moderator" is another version of *a member's role within the specific one of the defined communities.*
41. Olivier, column 24, line 66 - column 25, line 20 discloses a discussion board where a user can select a *topic of the specific one of the defined communities* ("a group forms around a theme") and a user "only sees content (...message postings...) of other users who form a match with the user." "Another alternative process is for to allow moderators, club owners, and other 'authorities' to view all messages..." Olivier, column 25, lines 7-10, lines 17-20. This is *each one of the collaborative conversation channels*

having an associated set of message types that is based on a topic of the specific one of the defined communities and a member's role within the specific one of the defined communities and according to pre-configured filter profiles corresponding to the member's role within the specific one of the defined communities. Scharber disclosed that one of the preferences for a client could include permissions lists. Scharber, column 3, lines 18-19. Olivier states the user profile information "specif[ies] user profile data and acceptance criteria data that control with whom and about what topics they wish to interact". Olivier, column 5, lines 24-26. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Invention to use the acceptance criteria data of Olivier as a client preference permission list in Scharber in order to prevent abusive users (Scharber, column 3, line 56).

42. Claim 29 is substantially the same as claim 1.

43. In regard to claim 31, Scharber disclosed:

filtering the message is further based on a user profile associated with each of the members. Column 4, lines 38-42

44. In regard to claim 33, Scharber disclosed:

automatically associating filtering parameters with each of the members based on a community type for each one of the defined communities and a channel type for each one of the collaborative conversation channels. Column 3, lines 51-62; column 4, lines 16-42

45. In regard to claim 34, Scharber disclosed:

each one of the collaborative conversation channels comprises one of an operational channel and a strategic channel. Column 4, lines 30-35

46. In regard to claim 35, Scharber disclosed:

providing the members of the specific community with the set of message types, wherein the message types in the set are based on a community type for each one of the defined communities, a channel type for each one of the collaborative conversation channels, and a role of the member within each one of the defined communities. Column 3, lines 51-62; column 4, lines 16-42

47. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scharber in view of Olivier in further view of Knight et al. (US 6,493,703).

48. In regard to claim 22, Scharber in view of Olivier disclosed a network news reader system on an abstract level, but failed to show a graphical program to present an icon for a news article. However, Knight shows that in the prior art, a news reader existed that assigned icons for each news article. See Knight, figure 1D, column 3, lines 55-67. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Knight with Scharber and Olivier to allow easy access to articles through a graphical environment on the client computer, or further to allow Knight to filter content (Knight, column 3, lines 56-67).

Conclusion

49. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

50. Beavers et al. US 7,733,366

51. Morin et al. US 7,761,518

52. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey R. Swearingen whose telephone number is (571)272-3921. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vivek Srivastava can be reached on 571-272-7304. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jeffrey R. Swearingen
Examiner
Art Unit 2445

/J. R. S./
Examiner, Art Unit 2445

/NIVEK SRIVASTAVA/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2445